

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 5, 2003 (Paper No. 8). Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 12, and 14 to 19 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 8 and 15 are still the only independent claims.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 12 and 14 to 19^{1/} were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,905,820 (Cushman) in view of U.S. Patent 5,867,277 (Melen). In response, the claims herein have been amended so as to emphasize that the invention is directed to machine-based optical character recognition rather than human-based recognition of characters through a biological visual system. Accordingly, Applicant maintains his traversal of the rejection, as explained more fully below.

The invention concerns optical character recognition in which OCR processing proceeds based on an OCR parameter. According to one feature of the invention, the OCR parameter is identified based on a reduced-resolution image, even though OCR processing proceeds based on the original resolution of the image.

In entering the rejection over Cushman, the Office Action took the position that Cushman "is related to character recognition by suggesting that digitally-processed images of handwritten and machine-printed characters are more legible when the number of gray levels ... was increased ...". It is clear, however, that the disclosure of Cushman is

^{1/}Actually, the Office Action listed "Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 10, 12 and 15 to 20". However, given the nature of the rejection and its explanation at pages 3 through 7 of the Office Action, it is clear that the claims listed above in the text were actually intended.

unrelated to machine-based OCR processing, but rather is directed to human-based recognition, and is consequently unrelated to the present invention. In support of this position, Applicant notes that lines 41 to 56 of Cushman's column 1 (which was relied on in the Office Action) cites two additional articles. Those articles have been obtained and are enclosed herewith; both are clearly related to human recognition and not machine-based OCR processing.

Since Cushman is unrelated to machine-based OCR processing, it naturally follows that Cushman does not identify a parameter for OCR processing based on a reduced resolution of a digitized image. It further follows that Cushman does not disclose or in any way suggest OCR processing of the full resolution digitized image based on the identified OCR parameter, so as to character recognize an object in the digitized image.

The patent to Melen has been reviewed, but is seen to add nothing to the above-discussed deficiencies of Cushman. Rather, Melen is seen to discuss storage of an image by recognizing characters therein and converting the characters into text data, and thereafter storing the text data together with a reduced-resolution version of the original image.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein would not have been obvious from any permissible combination of Cushman and Melen, and withdrawal of the § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 76724 v 1